

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/693,119	10/24/2003	Michael Martin	11461/4	1647	
43935 7	590 11/17/2004		EXAMINER		
FRASER MARTIN BUCHANAN MILLER LLC 132C WEST SECOND STREET			DONOVAN,	DONOVAN, LINCOLN D	
PERRYSBURG, OH 43551-1401			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	,		2832		

DATE MAILED: 11/17/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	•			arx			
Office Action Summary		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
		10/693,119	MARTIN, MICHAEL				
		Examiner	Art Unit				
		Lincoln Donovan	2832				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply							
THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - FailL Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR R MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATI nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 C SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communicative a period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, to period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory pure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by reply received by the Office later than three months after the ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ON. FR 1.136(a). In no event, however, mayon. a reply within the statutory minimum of the period will apply and will expire SIX (6) Mostatute, cause the application to become	a reply be timely filed hirty (30) days will be considered timely. DNTHS from the mailing date of this communicatio ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	n.			
Status							
1) 🔀	Responsive to communication(s) filed on	23 August 2004.					
·		This action is non-final.					
3)	, —						
Disposit	ion of Claims						
4)⊠ 5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) 8-20 is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Applicat	ion Papers						
10)⊠	The specification is objected to by the Example The drawing(s) filed on <u>24 October 2003</u> is Applicant may not request that any objection to Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the country The oath or declaration is objected to by the	s/are: a)⊠ accepted or b) o the drawing(s) be held in abey orrection is required if the drawi	ance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). ng(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 							
2) Notice	et(s) See of References Cited (PTO-892) See of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-94) Mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/Ser No(s)/Mail Date 12-29-03.	8) Paper N	v Summary (PTO-413) o(s)/Mail Date f Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) 				

Application/Control Number: 10/693,119

Art Unit: 2832

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Claims 8-20 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR

1.142(b) as being drawn to nonelected claimed species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made without traverse in the reply filed on 08-23-04.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Konno [US 3,604,027] in view of Weinstein [US 5,558,314].

Regarding claim 1, Konno discloses an apparatus for maintaining magnets in an opposing relationship comprising:

- a first magnet [12a] having a first magnetic field in a first orientation;
- a second magnet [12b] having a second magnetic field in a second orientation that substantially opposes the first orientation [column 1, lines 35-41]; and
 - a plurality of springs [11] cooperating with the magnets.

Konno disclose everything claimed except the springs being attached to the first and second magnets.

Application/Control Number: 10/693,119

Art Unit: 2832

Weinstein discloses a support apparatus having a plurality of support plates [68, 69] with springs [63] therebetween.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to mount the springs between the magnets of Konno, as suggested by Weinstein, in order to provide support for the springs.

Regarding claims 2-5, Konno discloses a plurality of springs being spaced equidistantly from each other. The specific number of springs used would have been an obvious design consideration based on size of the apparatus.

Regarding claim 6, Konno disclose everything claimed except the specific use of rare earth type magnets.

To use rare earth magnets for the magnetic apparatus of Konno would have been obvious to provide greater opposition force therebetween, as acknowledged by applicant in the specification, paragraphs 36-37.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Konno, as modified, as applied to claims 1 above, and further in view of Minnick [US 3,467,973].

Konno, as modified, disclose everything claimed except for varying the strength of the magnets used.

Minnick discloses a suspension apparatus having means [figure 3] to vary the force applied between two support surfaces [13, 14].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use magnets of differing strengths to vary the opposition force in

Application/Control Number: 10/693,119

Art Unit: 2832

Konno, as modified, as suggested by Minnick, for the purpose of accommodating uneven loads.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Regan [US 3,999,234], Usami [US 4,222,137], Slone [US 4,100,631] and Morgan et al. [US 4,181,931].

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lincoln Donovan whose telephone number is 571-272-1988. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Elvin Enad can be reached on 571-272-1990. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ldd